

circled in red. Authorization to make the amendment is respectfully requested.

With the above amendment, the objection to the drawings based on the figure number being present is overcome.

Reference to Figure 1 has been deleted from line 18 of page 4 to correspond with the drawing change.

Under section 2 of the office action, the drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The Patent Office has stated that R1 and C1 do not appear to be in series, as defined in claim 7.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 7 states that a first capacitor in series with a first resistor is connected between the rectifier circuit and the center tap of the secondary winding. The anodes of diodes D1 and D2, clearly being in the rectifier circuit, are shown clearly connected to the series circuit of capacitor C1 and resistor R1 to the center tap of the secondary winding. The fact that resistor R4 and capacitor C2 are also connected to capacitor C1 does not remove the fact that capacitor C1 and resistor R1 are connected in series between the rectifier circuit and the center tap of the secondary winding.

It is believed clear that the drawing illustrates what is defined in claim 7. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 for the reason that claims 3 and 5, on lines 2 and 5 respectively, contains the term "the short circuiting circuit" which allegedly lacks antecedent basis.

Applicant refers the Patent Office to claim 1, clause (c), wherein line 14, contains the word "a circuit", and in line 16 the words "for short circuiting" appears. A person reading clause (c) would put these words together to obtain meaning from the claim, to obtain the conjunction "a circuit for shorting circuiting".

This constitutes the antecedent for "the short circuiting circuit" in claims 3 and 5, lines 2 and 5 respectively.

It is believed that 35 U.S.C. 112 is met. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being anticipated by Hopkins et al (US 5,847,909). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the reason that the patent is inapplicable.

Applicant points out the filing date of the cited reference is April 17, 1997. Applicant's convention priority date is December 24, 1996, which is well prior to the filing date of the reference.

The applicant refers the Patent Office to a claim for priority request bearing the date July 28, 1997. By letter dated February 12, 1998 a certified copy of the convention application, Canadian patent application Serial No. 2,193,909, was filed. Applicant also refers the Patent Office to the Office Action Summary of the current office action, in which priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 is acknowledged, and confirms that all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Official notice of the priority date of this application is respectfully requested. In view of the priority date of this application, which precedes the filing date of the citation, withdrawal of the citation and of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

It is believed that this application is in form for allowance. Notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted



E.E. Pascal
Registration 22934

EEP:at
Pascal & Associates
P.O. Box 11121, Station H
Nepean, Ontario
Canada, K2H 7T8

RECEIVED
1999 MAY 24 PM 2:44
.GILROY CENTER - 2800